



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/803,896

03/19/2004

Jun Ebata

250627US2

6781

22850

7590

08/05/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MORAN, RANDAL D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/803,896	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EBATA, JUN	
	<b>Examiner</b> RANDAL D. MORAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-22, 24-32 are pending.

This Office Action is in response to amendment filed 3/13/2008.

Below, Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art(s) of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claims, other passages and figures may apply as well. Applicant should consider the entire prior art as applicable as to the limitations of the claims. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully each reference in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**1. Claims 1-19, 24, 25, 27-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Gennaro et al. (US 6,317,834)**, hereafter “Gennaro”.

Considering **Claims 1, 7 and 10**, Gennaro discloses an information providing device (abstract) comprising: a provider association unit making a plurality of

information providers (Fig. 4B- item 28, item 30, item 32), including first and second information providers (Fig. 4B- item 30 and item 32), be associated with each other (Fig. 4B- item 42), the plurality of information providers providing respective user information items (column 7- lines 16-39), the provider association unit comprising: a first unit causing the first information provider to receive a first user information item (Fig. 6- item 74, item 82, column 8- lines 9-24), stored in a first information management unit (Fig. 4A, column 6- lines 4-8), in response to a user information receiving request (column 7- lines 8-9); a second unit causing the second information provider to receive a second user information item (Fig. 6- item 90, column 7- lines 34-37), correlated with the first user information item and stored in a second information management unit (Fig. 3, column 5- lines 46-54), in response to a predetermined identification data (column 8- lines 24-32); and a third unit configured to generate an authentication ticket including data indicating at least one of an authentication provider name, a term of validity of the ticket, an authentication domain name, and user attributes by combining the first user information item and the second user information item based on the predetermined identification data (column 8- lines 37-47, the statistical equivalence is deemed valid if it exceeds a certain threshold), an interface configured to transmit the authentication ticket to a computer remote from the information providing device via a network (Fig. 9- item 866, column 11- lines 44-52, an acknowledgement including a “fail” or “success” is needed to inform a user of his authorization to the database).

Considering **Claims 12, 24, 25, 27, and 31**, Gennaro discloses a user authentication device (abstract) comprising: a provider association unit which makes a

plurality of authentication providers (Fig. 4B- item 28, item 30, item 32), including first and second authentication providers (Fig. 4B- item 30 and item 32), be associated with each other (Fig. 4B- item 42), the provider association unit comprising: a first unit causing the first authentication provider to perform, in response to a first authentication request, a first user authentication based on a first user identification data that is specified in the first authentication request (column 8- lines 9-32, Fig. 6); and a second unit causing the second authentication provider to perform, in response to a second authentication request related to a user approved by the first user authentication, a second user authentication based on a second user identification data that is correlated with the first user identification data (column 8- lines 32-47, Fig. 6).

Considering **Claims 2, 8, and 11**, Gennaro discloses the user information receiving request contains retrieval conditions specified therein, and the provider association unit causes the first and second information providers to respectively receive the first and second user information items that satisfy the retrieval conditions (Gennaro-Fig. 4B, column 7- lines 8-21).

Considering **Claims 3 and 9**, Gennaro discloses the provider association unit is provided to unify the information items received by the first and second information providers for every user (Gennaro-column 8- lines 37-47, Fig. 4B- item 42).

Considering **Claims 4 and 13**, Gennaro discloses the user authentication device further comprises the first authentication provider and the second authentication provider (Gennaro-Fig. 3, Fig 4B).

Considering **Claims 5, 16, and 29**, Gennaro discloses the user authentication device further comprises: a first-authentication-provider information management unit managing a first-authentication-provider identification data which identifies the first authentication provider from among the plurality of authentication providers (Gennaro-Fig. 3- item 330, column 7- lines 7-12); and a second-authentication-provider information management unit managing a second-authentication-provider identification data which identifies the second authentication provider from among the plurality of authentication providers (Gennaro-Fig. 3- item 330, column 7- lines 35-45).

Considering **Claims 6, 17, and 30**, Gennaro discloses the user authentication device further comprises a call information management unit in which a plurality of call information items used to call the plurality of authentication providers respectively are recorded (Gennaro-Fig. 3- item 340), and the provider association unit causes the first and second authentication providers to perform the first and second user authentications respectively by calling the first and second authentication providers based on the call information management unit (Gennaro-column 5- lines 17-38).

Considering **Claims 14, 15, 28, and 32**, Gennaro discloses the provider association unit further comprises a user-identification management unit in which the first user identification data and the second user identification data are correlated to each other and recorded (Gennaro-Fig. 3- item 330), and the provider association unit is provided to search for the second user identification data in the user-identification management unit based on the first user identification data (Gennaro-column 5- lines 17-23, column 7- lines 7-21).

Considering **Claim 18**, Gennaro discloses the first authentication provider creates a first electronic ticket which certifies approval of the user by the first authentication provider (Gennaro-column 7- lines 17-37), the second authentication provider creates a second electronic ticket which certifies approval of the user by the second authentication provider (Gennaro-column 7- lines 37-50), and the user authentication device provides information containing the first electronic ticket (Gennaro-column 7- lines 17-37), in response to the first authentication request and provides information containing the second electronic ticket, in response to the second authentication request (Gennaro-column 7- lines 37-50).

Considering **Claim 19**, Gennaro discloses the provider association unit creates a merge ticket in which the first electronic ticket and the second electronic ticket are unified (Gennaro- Fig. 6- item 92 and item 94), and the user authentication device provides a first merge ticket in which the first electronic ticket is unified (Gennaro-Fig. 6- item 84), in response to the first authentication request (Gennaro-Fig. 6- item 82), and provides a second merge ticket in which the second electronic ticket is unified further (Gennaro-Fig. 6- item 92), in response to the second authentication request (Gennaro-Fig. 6- item 90).

**2. Claims 20-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gennaro** in view of **Wheeler (US 2002/0026575)**, hereafter “Wheeler”.

Considering **Claims 20-22**, Gennaro does not explicitly disclose the user authentication device provides the merge ticket which is encoded, contains a term of validity, contains a code for ticket falsification check.

Wheeler discloses the user authentication device provides the merge ticket which is encoded (Wheeler- [0004]), contains a term of validity (Wheeler- [0007]- expiration date, contains a code for ticket falsification check (Wheeler- [0007]- serial number).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gennaro the user authentication device provides the merge ticket which is encoded, contains a term of validity, contains a code for ticket falsification check as taught by Wheeler for the benefit of increasing the strength of authentication based upon the specific resource being protected. For example, if the resource is a parking deck, only a minimal level of entity authentication is necessary; if the resource is a corporate checking account, stronger entity authentication is likely required; if the resource is the control system for launching nuclear warheads, even stronger entity authentication is required (Wheeler- [0161]).

**3. Claim 26** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gennaro**.

Considering **Claim 26**, Gennaro does not explicitly disclose the provider association unit is provided with a call function using a remote procedure call of SOAP. Gennaro is silent on an exact protocol used to generate call function. SOAP is a widely recognized protocol for exchanging messages over multiple computers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gennaro to provide remote procedure calls using SOAP as was widely known in the art for the benefit of facilitating communication between computers while allowing the use of multiple transport protocols such as HTTP, TCP, and SNMP.



***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randal D. Moran whose telephone number is 571-270-1255. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. D. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2135  
7/2/2008

/KimYen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135